

AMERICAN PSYCHOANALYSTS WHO INFLUENCED EUGENE O'NEILL'S *LONG DAY'S JOURNEY INTO NIGHT*

ANN-LOUISE S. SILVER, M.D.*

Eugene O'Neill's finest play, *Long Day's Journey Into Night*, owes enormously to the direct and personal influence of two American psychoanalysts, Smith Ely Jelliffe and Gilbert VanTassel Hamilton. Each independently taught O'Neill as well as some of his co-workers psychoanalytic theory, and collaborated in projects leading to publications. Jelliffe and Hamilton steered O'Neill and his colleagues to the writings of Freud, Jung, Edward Kempf, and Adolf Meyer, and discussed the material with them. Thus, their orientation and therapeutic efforts infuse this American classic.

Eugene O'Neill, a Nobel laureate often cited as the "father of American drama" (Gassner, 1967), spotlighted the troubled family, writing first of families in crises and later depicting them over many generations. Fascinated by family dynamics, he had embarked on a series of nine plays he called "the Cycle," involving a single family line spanning 150 years, including their transition from Old to New World (Sheaffer, 1968; Weissman, 1957).

Long Day's Journey into Night is not in the Cycle, but it is O'Neill's own autobiographic family drama. Dedicating the play to his wife, Carlotta, O'Neill wrote, "I mean it as a tribute to your love and tenderness which gave me the faith in love that enabled me to face my dead at last and write this play—write it with deep pity and understanding and forgiveness for all the four haunted Tyrones" (O'Neill, 1956, p. 7). O'Neill acknowledged that writing the play let him work through his conflictual feelings toward his family. Thus, the play illustrates the principles of reparation in a creative act as defined by Chasseguet-Smirgel (1984, p. 405).

*Past president of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis; current president of the United States Chapter of ISPS, the International Society for the Psychological treatments of the Schizophrenias and other psychoses; and on the faculties of the Washington Psychoanalytic Institute, the Washington School of Psychiatry, USUHS, and the Military Residency Program.

This paper was presented at the May 1990 meeting of The American Academy of Psychoanalysis, "Psychoanalysis and Creativity: Clinical and Artistic Perspectives."

The play takes place in August 1912, nine months after the 23-year-old O'Neill made a nearly fatal suicide attempt, overdosing on the barbiturate Veronal. August was four months before the Christmas Eve when he actually entered a tuberculosis sanatorium, the play's central event. Setting the play in American psychoanalytic history, it occurs three years after Freud's one trip to the United States, when he spoke at Clark University; 15 months after the founding of the American Psychoanalytic Association; and 3 months after C. G. Jung's trip to the United States, which was arranged by Smith Ely Jelliffe.

The play is a thinly veiled autobiography with much artistic embellishment, and temporally authentic. I will not discuss the play or O'Neill's family, assuming the reader's acquaintance with the play itself, but will concentrate on the impact of two analysts on O'Neill and thus on the theater.

Jelliffe probably is a name familiar to the reader, but few could do more than perhaps connect him to New York City and William Alanson White. In addition, John C. Burnham's excellent biography of Jelliffe includes Jelliffe's full correspondence with Freud and Jung, and some might know him as a prescient writer on psychosomatic themes.

Smith Ely Jelliffe was a rather heroic figure in American psychiatry. He wrote prolifically and eloquently about psychoanalysis, reaching a wide audience, both medical and general. The initial psychoanalytic fervor in the United States owes much to Jelliffe for his appreciation of European analysts' works, which he described with infectious enthusiasm in full and lucid reports. For example, Karl Menninger credits Jelliffe with igniting his analytic interest (Burnham, 1983, p. 157). Jelliffe was a synthesizer, someone who strove to bridge and unite areas of specialization; first botany with zoology, then neurology with psychiatry, psychiatry with psychoanalysis, and finally internal medicine with psychoanalysis.

Jelliffe's influence pervades the plays O'Neill wrote in the early and mid-1920s, among them *The Great God Brown*, *Strange Interlude*, *Desire Under the Elms*, and *Lazarus Laughed*. While scholars note that Freudian and Jungian notions pervade these dramas, Jelliffe's influence on O'Neill still needs careful research. Jelliffe's bibliography stretches to 17 pages of text; during some years, he wrote 16 articles. He corresponded prolifically and catalogued these letters in systematized notebooks now available at the Library of Congress. I have not, however, located any letters between him and O'Neill or O'Neill's theater associates.

Jelliffe's book *Psychoanalysis and the Drama*, which he wrote with his assistant Louise Brink in 1922, conveys the content and spirit of his conversations with his theater friends. O'Neill received an autographed copy of *Psychoanalysis and the Drama*, inscribed, "Eugene O'Neill—

with sincere esteem of Smith Ely Jelliffe" (Nethercot, 1973, p. 42). There are, however, no marginalia or markings in the book (Nethercot, 1973, p. 42). Jelliffe's book brought then-current analytic ideas to bear on a series of plays.

Chapter V, "Alcoholism and the Phantasy Life," is especially relevant to O'Neill, as it analyzes a dramatization of a story by Tolstoy depicting the dissolution and ultimate suicide of a chronic alcoholic living in flop houses, who had abandoned his wife. In addition to the obvious parallels with O'Neill's biography, the chapter includes a formulation which may well have influenced O'Neill's view of his mother (Jelliffe, 1922, pp. 68-76). O'Neill and his associates counted Jelliffe a valued friend and teacher. However, O'Neill vociferously resisted critics' efforts to view him as merely putting psychoanalytic views into dramatic form, and adamantly avoided crediting those who schooled him in psychoanalysis. For example, he said there was "no conscious use of psychoanalytic material in any of my plays. . . . The book that interested me the most of all those of the Freudian school is Jung's *Psychology of the Unconscious* . . . I would say that what has influenced my plays the most is my knowledge of the drama of all time—particularly Greek tragedy—and not any books on psychology" (Sheaffer, 1973, pp. 244-245).

Jelliffe was born in October of 1866 in New York City; he was 22 years older than O'Neill. His father, a schoolteacher and principal, established the first systematic kindergarten instruction in Brooklyn. His mother, too, was a teacher. Jelliffe's enthusiasm about teaching and his generosity in sharing his intellectual interests was a family feature extending over generations. His first career interest was botany; he published an extensive article on the flora of Prospect Park, and then taught a lively course on the medicinal uses of plants. He was a systematizer. Like O'Neill, his own genealogy and the impact of emigration fascinated him.

After graduating from Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons in 1890, Jelliffe became an editor and book reviewer for the *Medical Record*; then he married Helena Leeming, also a scientist and author, who anonymously shared editorial burdens with him. Later, Jelliffe became editor of a weekly, *Medical News*. In 1896, he began contributing to the *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, and became its editor in 1901, a position he held until 1944.

At age 30, having become interested in neurology, Jelliffe worked in the summer of 1897 at the Binghamton State Hospital, where he met his lifelong friend William Alanson White. Both had grown up in Brooklyn; both were writers. Jelliffe decided to specialize in psychoanalysis after regularly walking home from work through Central Park with A. A. Brill in 1910. In 1913, White and Jelliffe founded the *Psychoana-*

lytic Review, which was hugely influential in stirring interest in psychoanalysis. Jelliffe's wife died in 1916 of a ruptured cerebral aneurysm, and in 1925 his younger son, a medical student at Yale and champion swimmer, died in his room of a gunshot wound.

Jelliffe became an American psychoanalytic emissary to Europe, making almost yearly trips, reporting on the latest European advances, and translating innovative papers. He met often with Freud and with Jung, and tried to keep a positive regard toward both of them, even after Freud and Jung split. This cost Jelliffe his credibility with the New York Psychoanalytic Society, a group he founded, but which for a while excluded him as it became stricter and more orthodox. Jelliffe had arranged for C. G. Jung's speaking engagement at Fordham University in 1912, where Jung announced his dissent from Freud (Burnham, 1983, p. 155). Jelliffe was additionally suspect for his use of lay analysts. One, his co-author Louise Brink, was a former patient who later obtained a doctorate (Burnham, 1983, p. 211).

Jelliffe was a raconteur. He spoke to medical audiences and college classes, and enjoyed vibrant conversations among intellectual friends. A popular teacher who made dry subjects lively, Jelliffe received the nickname "Windy Jelliffe" from his students (Burnham, 1983, p. 45). He owned a 145-acre property on Lake George at Huletts Landing where guests were always welcomed. In New York City, he and his second wife, a nurse, held popular weekly "at-home"s, both especially enjoying the theater crowd.

In 1914 he met Mabel Dodge Luhan, a hostess catering to the intelligentsia of the art world, à la Gertrude Stein. Leo Stein, Gertrude's brother, attended Mabel's gatherings. There, Jelliffe met the triumvirate: O'Neill, Robert Edmond Jones (the stage designer for nearly all of O'Neill's plays, and the person whose biography and personality inspired many of O'Neill's New England characters), and Kenneth Macgowan (drama critic, and director of O'Neill's plays). Jelliffe attempted to treat Jones and O'Neill for their alcoholism.

Luhan describes but does not date the following event, which could have been as early as 1914: "Jelliffe had been curious about the Finney Farm constellation and I had asked him for a week-end. . . . Before dinner he had found Bobby [Robert Edmond Jones] making sketches for a play, out on the dining-room table. These drawings decided him that Bobby, too, needed psychoanalysis, and before long I led him unresistingly to Jelliffe's office" (Burnham, 1983, p. 145). Burnham comments, "She had introduced Jelliffe further into New York intellectual circles and through him had done a great deal to extend psychoanalytic thinking among an important group of people in the arts" (Burnham, 1983,

p. 148). Burnham continues, "Insofar as Mabel Dodge Luhan's salon was an institution, Jelliffe may through that medium have conveyed ideas in an important way to segments of the artistic and intellectual world, so that leading thinkers not only talked about psychoanalysis but accepted imaginative and literary and a more or less Jungian version of psychoanalysis as the genuine coin" (Burnham, 1983, p. 156).

Jelliffe was so well integrated into the theater world that he confidently promised his daughter, then a high school senior, and her friend, spots playing Shakespeare on Broadway. His daughter recounted, "This was 1920, and Arthur Hopkins, producer, and Robert Edmond Jones, scene and costume designer, were producing Shakespeare's *Richard III* with John Barrymore at the Plymouth Theatre on Broadway. . . . Father was very interested in the theatre, in art, and in music, and he related it to his work. He gave his suggestions how Ophelia should sing her Mad Song in *Hamlet* . . . I played in this and in *Macbeth*, with Lionel Barrymore, in 1921" (Burnham, 1983, p. 151). She added, "With his interest in theatre and knowing Arthur Hopkins, Jones, and Barrymore, he learned much of stage presence and elocution and became a superb speaker on and off stage" (Burnham, 1983, p. 151).

O'Neill consulted Jelliffe in 1924, and then wired his brother, Jamie, "Just consulted Jelliffe, famous specialist here, on Mama's case. He says hopeless but last resort call best man on Coast, Samuel D. Ingham, Los Angeles. Mention Jelliffe" (Sheaffer, 1973, p. 82).

Jelliffe later referred Robert Edmond Jones to Jung for treatment. A letter from Jung to Jelliffe, dated July 21, 1927 says, "Yes, Jones was all right—a pleasure to work with such a fellow! I hope you are in good health. My best regards to yourself and to Dr. White." Jones wrote to Mary Foote, a portrait artist among whose subjects was Jelliffe, that Jung "got right down the first days farther than Jelliffe ever got." (Burnham, 1983, p. 210).

Jelliffe's style was intuitive and perhaps flamboyant. He never had a personal analysis, although he had a few sessions with Paul Federn in 1914, the treatment being interrupted by World War I (Burnham, 1983, p. 74). The only excerpt by a patient of his comes from the hostess herself, Mabel Dodge Luhan. Jelliffe treated her, also in 1914. He couched his interpretations in the background of Jung's teachings. She said, "I enjoyed my visits three times a week to Jelliffe's office. He had a speculative mind with an amusing intuition. As he turned my attention more and more upon the inner workings of my own nature, curious spiritual events began to occur, and my starved perceptions, that had been centered for months upon [my husband] Maurice, reveled in the new direction of interest" (Burnham, 1983, p. 144).

Nethercot's (1960, 1961, 1973) impressive detective work additionally revealed that when O'Neill said to Malcolm Cowley, in November 1922, "There are enough case histories in this book to furnish plots to all the playwrights who ever lived," he was referring to Edward Kempf's *Psychopathology* (Nethercot, 1973, p. 37). Kempf wrote this textbook while a staff psychiatrist working under William Alanson White at St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D.C. (Engel, 1990). I wonder whether Jelliffe gave O'Neill this book. Kempf had previously trained at the Phipps Clinic of the Johns Hopkins Hospital under Adolf Meyer, its first departmental chair. Kempf states in the preface that the case material was drawn from experiences with patients in both institutions. This volume represents the first American effort to apply psychoanalytic discoveries systematically to the treatment of the psychoses (Gach, 1982, p. 145; Engel, 1990).

I especially liked Kempf's case presentation and accompanying photograph of a tightly smiling, simpering young woman wearing a floor-length white dress, with wisps of hair springing out of place. The caption reads: "Regression to infancy, thereby escaping the trials of an unhappy marriage and the responsibilities of raising her family." O'Neill may have used this image to create the character "Mary," who manifests a rather unique retrogressive regression. For me, this documents the shaky structure we inhabit when we attempt to move from discussions of characters in a drama to formulations regarding the actual people whose lives are depicted. Sheaffer (1968, p. 242) substantiates this when he says, "O'Neill took liberties with the past in *Long Day's Journey*, for he was giving not a literal account of things as they were but a distillation of the family's history. The son's ruling concern with truth was matched by the artist's concern with selective emphasis, with maximum impact. He telescoped events, he altered chronology, he invented circumstance, he suppressed fact, he modified this; he touched up that, all in the name of artistic truth."

Long Day's Journey into Night marks O'Neill's transition from the romantic vision of reality to a tragic-ironic view (Schafer, 1970). It documents O'Neill's personal transition from a romantic to someone with a more mature life perspective. O'Neill was 38 years old at the time he met Gilbert VanTassel Hamilton. His career was taking off, but his alcoholism was severe. His temper and his sometimes frantic dependency on his second wife, Agnes Boulton, his career tensions, and financial instability all contributed to paranoia and impulsivity. Disaster seemed inevitable had he not stopped drinking.

O'Neill had attempted suicide fifteen years earlier. His mother had died following a stroke 4 years earlier; he couldn't get his act together to go to her bedside, but wired his alcoholic older brother saying he would

do whatever he could to help. The night of her death, he walked with his friend Saxe Commins. "The floodgates opened and out poured a tide of reminiscence full of old grief and bitterness about his family, matter that one day would be reworked and distilled into *Long Day's Journey into Night*" (Sheaffer, 1973, pp. 81-86).

Two vignettes reported in Leslie Sheaffer's biography of O'Neill convey how self-loathing and brittly explosive O'Neill was. When drunk, he had urinated into an empty wine bottle and then drank the contents (Sheaffer, 1973 p. 96) And describing an event occurring a few days before O'Neill met Hamilton, Agnes Boulton's sister Cecil said, "I liked him, but Gene was a different person—he could be a fiend—when he drank." Sheaffer comments that "Cecil was probably thinking of the night she and her husband, Edward Fiske, were drinking with O'Neill in his study when he took a revolver out of his desk and sighted along the barrel. 'See that little thing on the wall there? I'm a good shot, I could put a bullet right through it.' Suddenly the unsteady gun was pointed at Cecil, seated a few feet away, as he said, 'I could shoot you right in the middle of your forehead.' She and her husband sat paralyzed for long seconds, till he finally put the gun away" (Sheaffer, p. 187).

A few days later, early in 1926, he met Hamilton. The play, in fact, is a direct outgrowth of O'Neill's treatment by this pioneering analytically informed couples' therapist and researcher. Hamilton acted as a powerful catalyst for constructive change in O'Neill, who credits Hamilton with curing his alcohol addiction.

Born in Ohio in 1877, Hamilton graduated from Ohio Wesleyan and received his M.D. from Jefferson Medical College in 1901, then studied with Robert Yerkes at Harvard. His psychiatric training was at the State Hospital for the Insane in Warren, Pennsylvania, and then at the McLean Hospital. Between 1908 and 1917 he did research in comparative psychology, then headed the Division of Psychobiological Research of the Bureau of Social Hygiene in New York City, where his "Research in Marriage" was done between 1924 and 1928. He then directed the Santa Barbara Socialization Institute, where he established and studied a colony of chimpanzees in a natural habitat. His interests were extraordinarily diverse, and his energy immense. He wrote a textbook, *Introduction to Objective Psychopathology* (Hamilton, 1925), and a novel, *The Adversary in Tomika*. His interests were so far-ranging, and he moved around the country so frequently, that he never claimed a territory of specialization for which he is remembered. He died at age 66 in 1943 in Santa Barbara (*Who Was Who . . .*, 1950, p. 231).

Hamilton was never formally credentialed as an analyst, although he had some analytic sessions, "when some experience as an analysand in

1925 made it emotionally possible for me to begin what has become a final shift from psychiatric behaviorism to psychoanalysis" (Hamilton, 1933, p. 388). (I have imagined him in treatment with Jelliffe.) He wrote a fascinating paper on an innovative use of the blackboard visible to both patient and analyst (Hamilton, 1933). As a dream was reported, he outlined its components to avoid succumbing to the temptation of avoiding aspects of the dream arousing anxiety in himself.

Hamilton's and O'Neill's paths crossed when both were in New York City. Hamilton was then 46 years old, "paternal-looking, prematurely white-haired, . . . bore some resemblance to philosopher John Dewey. Hamilton had, besides a reassuring personality, a comfortable, unobtrusive way of conducting his interviews" (Sheaffer, 1973, p. 189). He had studied with Adolf Meyer between 1907 and 1916, and said,

What Meyer tried to tell me was this: Never wander a hair's breadth from the facts of subjective experience in an impatient effort to make logical constructions gratify your urge to explain things. Sufficiently patient and prolonged observation may be expected to disclose, in time, various natural lines of cleavage within the total psychodynamic set-up of the individual, and when enough patients are studied in this spirit we or our successors shall come to know what particular types of events—both inner and outer—characteristically occur in recognizable constellation and sequence patterns. (Hamilton, 1929, pp. xii-xiii)

O'Neill, age 34, was trying to get *The Great God Brown* staged. Severely alcoholic, he was either drunk or mildly inebriated continually. Meanwhile, Hamilton was making the first systematic study of the psychodynamics of couples. This largely forgotten but fascinating book predates the more formally acknowledged "beginning" of family research in the 1940s. Hamilton explored the question, "Is marriage in itself a faulty institution in that it prescribes a mode of relationship between spouses which tends, in the end, either seriously to impair or to destroy an originally established congeniality and an originally high sexual reactive value of spouse for spouse? Or does the fault lie essentially in the kinds of reactive equipment that environmental influences tend to build up for us through infancy, childhood and adolescence?" (Hamilton, 1929, p. 3).

Hamilton asked for volunteer research subjects, and planned to write the project up in two versions, one for the scientific community, entitled *A Research in Marriage* and the other for the general public, entitled *What is Wrong with Marriage?* The latter version he co-authored with O'Neill's close friend and collaborator, Kenneth Macgowan. The 200 research subjects (100 men, 100 women) were hardly a diverse group. They were friends who had referred each other to Hamilton. O'Neill

wrote in his diary, "Kenneth has made date with Hamilton for me. A ray of hope amid general sick despair" (Sheaffer, 1973, p. 188). "All the participants were entitled, after their questioning was complete, to a reasonable number of free consultations with Hamilton concerning their marital and other personal problems" (Sheaffer, 1973, p. 188). "In a modification of the Freudian couch he had his subjects sit in a chair fastened in position, facing away from him, and silently handed them one at a time file cards containing questions of a searching personal nature" (Sheaffer, 1973, p. 189).

The heroic scope of the project is indicated in Card A, which read, "What is there in your marriage that is especially unsatisfactory to you?" (Hamilton, 1929, p. 19). There followed 45 more cards. The next jumped right in, asking the husband's and wife's income for each year of the marriage, with 16 subquestions on this card, including, "Does your spouse consider you extravagant, stingy, or fair in your habits with reference to money matters?" (Hamilton, 1929, p. 20). Card 2 asked about the people living in the household with the couple, and their attitudes towards that individual and the spouse, and about their friendships, sanctioned by the other and not. Card 3 asked the reasons why the person continued to stay with the spouse, including the question, "If by some miracle you could press a button and find that you had never been married to your spouse, would you press that button?" (Hamilton, 1929, p. 22).

Attitudes about pregnancy and menstruation were similarly direct (Hamilton, 1929, p. 25). "Orgasm" was defined on Card 9. Card 10 asked all about it. Subjects were asked about their earliest sexual experiences; incest was tabulated. Sheaffer (1973, pp. 189-90) comments,

A man with great respect for artistic talent, Hamilton was both eager to help the playwright and apprehensive that he might do him more harm than good. In his view the talented are so complex, the roots of their creativity so often entwined with the sources of their neuroses, that psychoanalysis could possibly benefit them as persons at the same time that it injured them as artists. Consequently, he treated O'Neill with special care; but O'Neill, instead of being discouraged by his cautious attitude, found it easy to talk to the solicitous, fatherly doctor.

In all, for both the sex-research interviews and the consultations afterward, Eugene saw the psychiatrist over a period of only six weeks; yet in this time he arrived, almost miraculously, at a major turning point in his life: he resolved never to drink again. Except for several isolated falls from grace, he was to remain abstinent the rest of his days. . . .

His participation in the research project and his consultations afterward with Hamilton (which he incorrectly used to call his "analysis" launched O'Neill on a journey into the past that led to his drawing up two papers in

which he summarized his early years and the familial forces that had shaped him. The two documents are in a script so minuscule (sic) that they almost defy reading even with a magnifier; he evidently tried to make them illegible, except to himself, in case they ever fell into another's hands.

The language of the diagram is, on the whole, explicit, explicit, except for the words "discovery of mother's inadequacy," which guardedly refer to the traumatic night in New London when his mother tried to drown herself and he at last was informed that she was a morphine addict, that her addiction had begun with his birth . . . The other document, also on one side of a single page, summarizes a great deal of the background history that would be divulged in his family portrait. Taken as a unit, the two papers can be considered his first step toward writing, some fifteen years later, *Long Day's Journey Into Night*.*

The words form a tightly branching tree, transected by lines representing critical ages. Strikingly, the form of the chart is that of Adolf

*Mary's morphinism requires historical background. Additionally, she manifests a peculiar phenomenon of retrogressive amnesia, a feature not currently linked with morphine addiction. Morphine addiction became increasingly prevalent in the United States in the aftermath of the Civil War. In 1912, governments were barely beginning to direct serious attention to the problem of opium traffic. The Hague Opium Convention, the product of Theodore Roosevelt's efforts, met in 1912 and led to the requirement that the adhering powers control traffic in opium and cocoa leaves and to confine their use to legitimate medical purposes. The Harrison Narcotics Act of 1914, the basic narcotic drug statute of the United States, exempted physicians, through its ambiguous wording, from complying with the newly required records-keeping of narcotics handling.

Reviewing the 1912 medical literature I found an astounding paucity of material on "morphinism." *The American Journal of Insanity*, forerunner of *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, contained 1,616 pages for the years 1910 through 1912. They contained no mention of morphinism or other drug abuse. I located only four review articles, two in the British literature and two from *The Journal of the American Medical Association* (Bishop, 1912; Gamgee, 1908; Miller, 1910; Wholey, 1919). These focused on attempts to explain withdrawal symptoms. There was a consensus that the illness was best treated with rest-cures and counseling strength of will. Strecker (1944, p. 402) has tabulated the diagnoses of all soldiers of World War I returning home from overseas due to neuropsychiatric disability. Of 16,638 cases, only 102 were diagnosed as alcoholic, and 12 as suffering drug addiction: denial of these conditions was thus extremely high. These sources give clear evidence that O'Neill represented 1912 medical approaches in an historically accurate way.

Mary's retrograde amnesia (if not O'Neill's dramatic construction) seems hysterically based, similar to the hysterical paralyses reported at the beginning of the century. None of the articles from this time period mentions such a phenomenon. I turned to the early medical records of the Henry Phipps Clinic of The Johns Hopkins Hospital, which coincidentally had opened in 1912) under the chairmanship of Dr. Adolf Meyer. I reviewed the charts of all patients admitted there between 1912 and 1914, a total of 58 records. These charts were extremely detailed, including careful descriptions of the patients' homes and long transcriptions of interviews between patients and doctors. They strikingly conveyed the same fatalistic and moralistic attitude so strongly held by the characters in the

Meyer's "life chart." It substantiates the impact of Hamilton's work with O'Neill, and unites in historic continuum O'Neill's study of his family and Meyer's detailed psychosocial studies. This almost-direct influence of the founder of American psychiatry on the founder of modern American drama (Gassner, 1967, p. xi) has not been noted previously.

I was amazed to see that O'Neill noted that his mother, who professed her yearning to have been a nun, had undergone repeated abortions. The playwright's birth resulted only because that abortion attempt failed.

Intriguingly, Sheaffer juxtaposes his next mention of Hamilton with his discription of O'Neill's beginning involvement with Carlotta Monterey, who was to become his third wife and to whom *Long Day's Journey* was dedicated. In October of 1926, when O'Neill was 38, Sheaffer says,

In the midst of busy days largely devoted to *Horizon* rehearsals and fresh efforts to arouse managerial interest in *Marco* and *Lazarus*, the playwright found time to consult Dr. Gilbert Hamilton in regard to the psychological aspects of *Strange Interlude*, which was now about half written. He also resumed seeing Carlotta Monterey. . . . Her account, pieced together from several interviews, follows: "He came up on three afternoons. . . . I hardly knew the man . . . and he paid no more attention to me than if I were that chair, and he began to talk about his early life—that he had no real home,

play itself. The final diagnoses seemed more like pronouncements, predictions of the general course of future life events, implying a poignant finality.

Of these 58 cases, 18 carried medical diagnoses such as tertiary syphilis (10), cerebral vascular accidents (4), or intracranial tuberculosis (2). None of these involved morphine. Among the remaining 40 cases, 12, or 30%, involved morphine either as an abuse or addiction (11) or as prescribed by the family doctor (9) or by the psychiatrist at Phipps (3). There is overlap among these three groups. The diagnoses carried by the morphine abusers included dementia praecox (4), hysteria (3) and depression (2), with one case each of mania, constitutional defective and alcoholic hallucinosis.

Two of these 12 morphine addicts were women. Both suffered from obscure intestinal problems. One vomited her food unless given morphine by her family doctor, who soon taught the patient self-administration so that house calls were not continual. The progress notes describe her complaining in a "stagey, very emotional" manner. "For instance, she will say she is dying, to feel her pulse and notice her poor, emaciated body, then she lays [*sic*] very quietly, breathing deeply and rolling her eyes. The next moment she will sit up in bed and scream, saying the doctors do not treat her right, that she has not slept for three nights. and they won't give me medicine, etc." The chart review revealed that Mary was far from alone in suffering from morphine addiction as an isolating and shaming illness affecting any social class, and often introduced by physicians. But the review did not reveal whether Mary's retreat into her past was expected behavior in morphine addicts. It was fascinating to note how casually the problem of morphine addiction was mentioned in many of these cases. Often, previously noted morphine addiction would be totally ignored in the concluding detailed formulation of the individual's problems.

that he had no mother in the real sense, no father in the real sense, no one to treat him as a child should be treated . . . those three afternoons I sat and listened to this man—at first I was a little worried, and then I was deeply unhappy. (Sheaffer, 1973, p. 233)

She seems to me to have been a displacement figure for Hamilton and his research chair.

Hamilton's influence extended beyond these 6 weeks: "Kenneth," referred to above, was Kenneth Macgowan, a drama critic and journalist, who was one of the long-time triumvirate that included O'Neill and Robert Edmond Jones. Additionally, he worked closely with Hamilton during the four years of the research project, and co-authored the non-technical book, *What is Wrong with Marriage?* The three socialized together in New York City.

O'Neill's work diary for 1925 includes references to Hamilton. A review of the O'Neill collection housed in Yale University's Beineke Rare Book Library reveals only one letter from Hamilton to O'Neill's wife, Agnes Boulton, in which he gives details for their ordering Freud's *Collected Papers*. It concludes, "I have so many pleasant memories of my contacts with both of you that I look forward to a renewal of them. Mr. O'Neill has very kindly invited *me* to visit you at Ridgefield. This may not be possible, but Mrs. Hamilton and I hope to spend some time in Provincetown this summer, at which time I hope we may be able to have some leisurely visits. Sincerely yours, G. V. Hamilton."

Also in the file was a hand-written outline by Agnes Boulton, on Hamilton's stationery, listing the intervals during the prior year when O'Neill was drinking and how much.

O'Neill's letters to Macgowan frequently ask if Macgowan had returned books to Hamilton, adding, "Tell Doctor Hamilton I often think of him—as always with gratitude and affection—and that I'm going to write him one of these days. Read him this letter, too. I want him to know I'm happy and going strong because I know he'd be pleased to know it. Has he ever finished the play—the one he read me the first part of? He certainly ought to. It was grand stuff. But I suppose he's 'up to his ears' on his own job" (April 27, 1928, p. 178). "Tell Doc. Hamilton he's right about marriage, Take it from a good Catholic! But free love, as I've bitterly learned from all the humiliating dodges we've had to go through in the past year even in Europe & the East, is a worse form of slavery to convention when you're in the public eye with 'the boys' after you and people beside yourself to be protected! But, come to think of it, that's all an effect of marriage too! Yes, the Doc is entirely correct! I'm sorry about the book [*What Is Wrong with Marriage*] I had imagined it was

booming" (June 14, 1929). "All best to Doc. H. when you write. Is there any chance of his ever coming to Europe? Would love to have him here" (July 26, 12, p. 13). And finally, "Ever see Dr. Hamilton? If so, my warm greetings to him" (October 16, 1933, p. 205).

Hamilton stated in concluding his research report,

Looking back over this research we are struck with an immense pessimism. It is not over the institution of marriage. It is merely despair over the way in which the sins of the fathers are visited upon the children, and the children, growing up, inevitably repeat the process. Again and again we see the misery of maturity driving men and women to teach their children exactly those things which will perpetuate the misery when the children themselves grow up. In this respect the family circle seems a vicious circle. It seems indeed the greatest vicious circle ever conceived: for its circumference has become the straight line of descent from parent to child world without end. (Hamilton and Macgowan, 1929, pp. 308-309)

I like to think that Jelliffe and Hamilton knew each other. Both lived in New York during the 1920s, and both developed an intense interest in Freud and Jung as well as modern theater. Only 11 years apart in age, it seems likely that their paths crossed and that they exchanged ideas. Hamilton's paper on the use of the blackboard in dream interpretation was published in *The Psychoanalytic Review*, which was closely edited by Jelliffe, and appeared in 1933 in a volume which also contained a Jelliffe article, "The death instinct in somatic and psychopathology."

To summarize, O'Neill and his theatrical co-workers spent much time in informal discussions of psychoanalytic ideas, and embarked on related readings. They drew sustenance from two prolific and creative analysts, Jelliffe and Hamilton, both of whom were dedicated researchers and teachers. Further research may bring to light correspondence between these two analysts, or even evidence that Jelliffe treated Hamilton. Their influence on the theater triumvirate of O'Neill, Jones, and Macgowan was enormous. While Hamilton especially worried that his efforts might impede O'Neill's creativity, the opposite proved to be the case.

References

- Bishop, E. (1912), Morphine and its treatment, *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 58, 1499-1504.
- Bryer, J. (1982), *The Theatre We Worked For: The Letters of Eugene O'Neill to Kenneth MacGowan*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Burnham, J. (1983), *Jelliffe: American Psychoanalyst and Physician and His Correspondence with Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung*, W. McGuire (ed.), University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

- Chasseguet-Smirgel, J. (1984), Thoughts on the concept of reparation and the hierarchy of creative acts, *International Review of Psychoanalysis*, 11, 399-406.
- Du Mez, A. (1919), Increased tolerance and withdrawal, phenomena in chronic morphinism: A review of the literature, *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 72, 1069-1072.
- Engel, M. (1987), Contributions of Edward Kempf, *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis*, 18, 167-184.
- Gach, J. (1980), Culture and complex: On the early history of psychoanalysis in America, in E. Wallace, and L. Pressley, (Eds.), *Essays in the History of Psychiatry: A Tenth Anniversary Supplementary Volume to the Psychiatric Forum*, R. L. Bryan, Columbia, SC.
- Gamgee, A. (1908), On chronic morphinism and its treatment, *Lancet*, 68, 794-796.
- Gassner, J. (ed.). (1967), *Best Plays of the Early American Theatre, From the Beginning to 1916*, Crown Publishers, New York.
- Hamilton, G. (1925), *An Introduction to Objective Psychopathology*, C. V. Mosby, St. Louis.
- . (1929), *A Research in Marriage*, Albert & Charles Boni, New York.
- . (1933), The blackboard as an analytic accessory, *Psychoanalytic Review*, 20, 388-400.
- Hamilton, G., and Macgowan K. (1929), *What is Wrong with Marriage?* Albert & Charles Boni, New York.
- Jelliffe, S. E., and Brink L. (1922), *Psychoanalysis and the Drama*, Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Company, New York.
- Jung, C. G. (1916), *Psychology of the Unconscious*, B. Hinkle (trans.), Dodd, Mead & Co., New York.
- Kempf, E. (1920), *Psychopathology*, C. V. Mosby, St. Louis, MO.
- Macgowan, K., and Rosse, H. (1923), *Masks and Demons*, Harcourt, New York.
- Miller, H. C. (1910), The treatment of morphinomania by the "combined" method, *British Medical Journal*, 53, 1595-1597.
- Nethercot, A. (1960), The psychoanalyzing of Eugene O'Neill; Part One, *Modern Drama*, 3, 242-256.
- . (1961), The psychoanalyzing of Eugene O'Neill; Part Two, *Modern Drama*, 3, 357-372.
- . (1973), The psychoanalyzing of Eugene O'Neill: P. P. S., *Modern Drama*, 16, 35-48.
- O'Neill, E. (1956), *Long Days Journey into Night*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- . (November 1932), Memoranda on masks, *American Spectator*.
- . (1951), *The Plays of Eugene O'Neill*, 3 vols., Random House, New York.
- Schafer, R. (1970), The psychoanalytic vision of reality, *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 51, 270-297.
- Sheaffer, L. (1968), *O'Neill, Son and Playwright*, Little, Brown and Co., Boston.
- . (1973), *O'Neill. Son and Artist*, Little, Brown and Co., Boston.
- Strecker, E. (1944), Military psychiatry: World War I, 1917-1918, in J. Hall, G. Zilboorg, and H. Bunker (eds.), *One Hundred Years of American Psychiatry*, Columbia University Press, New York, p. 402.
- Weissman, P. (1957), Conscious and unconscious autobiographical dramas of Eugene O'Neill, *Journal of American Psychoanalytic Association*, 5, 432-460.
- White, W. A. (1921), *Outlines of Psychiatry*, Nervous and Mental Disease Monograph Series No. 1, Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing, Washington, D.C.
- Who Was Who in America, 1943-1950* Vol. 2 (1950), Gilbert Van Tassel Hamilton.
- Wholey, C. (1912), Morphinism in some of its less commonly noted aspects, *J.A.M.A.* 58, 1855-1856.

4966 Reedy Brook Lane
Columbia, MD 21044-1514